App. F. IX-4

Reserve pp 1-40

1926.

File No. 25-26

Previous References LB)

Serial Nos. 31? 33? ~~34~~ ~~35~~, 38, 40, 43 50, 52, 56.

Later References
LB 25-26 & 60261
LB 10-28 (18-19)
SRA 521-30 (1-3)
L.B. 70-31 (1-2)
SRA 432-32 (1-4)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos.

Part B for Feb 27.

SUBJECT

Proposals for the appointment of Sanitary Inspectors in the Bangalore District as Panchayat Inspectors

56 To, The D.C. Bangalore & the Comptroller
No. L 5709-11/ dt 15.2.27.

Sanctions the proposal of the Dy. Comm. in the matter & passes orders in the matter of the appointment of messrs Varadu raju & Ramalingaraju as Panchayat Inspectors

JB 1.4.27.

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

L.B File No. 25 of 1926

Serial No.

21 Letter No. C. 2- 818/26-2) & 7.1.27 from the Dy Com^r, Bangalore Dist)

States that he has not received any reply from the President of the Dist Board of Bangalore to his demi-official letter regarding the minimum staff required for the New District Board and a list of those that are to be thrown out of the existing staff. The Taluk Boards establishments and that, as the working of the new Dist Board Regn & members on the Board is to be constituted hereafter, it is perhaps better to leave the question of retrenchment to be finally decided by the New Dist Board and requests to receive instructions whether pending the decision of the new Board, the Dy Com^r may make temporary arrangements for the work of Clerks and Village Panchayet Inspectors.

22 Letter No 525/26-27 & 7.1.27 from the President, Dist Board of Bangalore.

Submits a copy of the resolution of the Finance committee approving of the lists of retrenchments and redeployments of the existing staff and of the Dist and Taluk Boards and states that the matter will be placed before the next Dist Board meeting

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

L.B File No. 25 of 1926.

Serial No.

In para 6 of G.O. No. L 3069-124/LB 25-26 dt. the 12th Nov. 1926 each of the ~~Dts~~ Boards ~~was~~ requested to submit proposals regarding the minimum staff of the Dist. and Taluk Boards including Panch. Inspectors to be required sufficient for the efficient discharge of the duties devolving on the new District Boards, and to take timely steps to discharge the remaining staff at the end of the terms of the Boards.

~~Reports~~

With reference to the above order the Chairman, Bangalore Dist. Board has stated that President, Dist. Board has not yet submitted definite proposals in the matter and suggests that it is perhaps better to leave the question of retrenchment to be finally decided by the new District Board, as the orders, that pending the coming of the new Board, he may be allowed to make temporary arrangements for the work of the Clerks and Village Panchayat Inspectors.

The President, Dist. Board has since submitted the following proposals of the Finance Committee regarding the reductions and retention of the ~~existing~~ staff of the ~~Dist.~~ former Dist. and Taluk Boards in the District:

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

(6) File No. 23 of 1926

Serial No.

Reductions :-

4. All the clerks in the Taluk Board Offices together with five Sanitary Inspectors, four Attendars and three peons.

X Retentions :-

Name of Taluk.	Sanitary Inspector	Attender	Peon	Vaccinators (according to requirements)
1. Bangalore	1	1	1	2
2 Kankanhalli	1	1	1	2
3 Devanhalli & Hoskote	1	1	1	2
4. Devanhalli & Doddaballapur	1	1	1	4
5 Kolaramangala & Magadi	1	1	1	4
6. Closepet & Channapatna	1	1	1	2
7. District Reserve	1	1	1	1
Total.	7	7	7	17

5 The new District Board establishment

(1) Head clerk (2) 2nd clerk for Cash Accounts (3) 3rd clerk for Karnamat (4) 4th clerk for accounts (5) 5th clerk for Vital Statistics &c (7) 6th clerk for Despatcher (8) 7th clerk - Record-Keeper (9) 8th clerk Despatcher - Under Lang) of this Office, who has the privilege of Mysore, Retrenched and the Head may recommend that the thereout Quarters should be provided in the Pensionary Scheme without suffering in their emoluments

6 The President of the District Board has reported that he has given directions the Presidents of Taluk Boards to give

Mushir of the War Office

H B

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

Notices of the discharge to certain hands specified and that the fact has been intimated to the Dy Comr.

He further states that a post position statement of supervising staff required under the new Dist Board will be submitted after the Dist Board is set up. This is right with [illegible] of the Rules submitted for orders.

B

13/1/27 Query be provided in the Village Panchayat Schemes.

In para 2 of the President's letter it is stated that no decision has been impossible of the issue of notices etc of the latter may be asked to arrange to provide for the transfer men, the Dist Bd precedence may be awaited

13/1/27 If it is practicable that the President has communicated lists of persons to be thrown out & the other. We should be requested to call the Cases of these men into Consideration in the New Panchayat appointments. Letters to Consult the Heads of Depts where it is not possible to provide the thrown out hands permanently

of the Scheme has the power to project by the new Dist Bd at its first meeting

The answer is that pending receipt of lists from the Dists the Govt has taken measures to avoid hardships to Dist. Bds and has issued copies of the Rules to Dists. requesting that the Dist Bds may make temporary appointments for 6 months.

7457 17/1

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

17/1/27

17/1

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 25 of 1926

Serial No.

On receipt of the reference from the Addl. Secy. about the hands the Minister and was shown to the Minister & he was pleased to say that the Inspectors attention may be invited to the & he may be asked to take the requisite further action

12/Mem pls. draft accordingly

WD
18/1

39 Letter No. C-2-3187/26-27 § 17.1.27 from the Secy, Bangalore Dist.

States that it is ascertained from Heads of the Sub Inspectors who are proposed to be promoted, are drawing higher salary than Rs 60/- per mensem, that there are no vacancies to absorb them on their present salary and that they cannot be appointed as Village Panchayat Inspectors as the pay of the latter post is fixed at Rs 60/- per mensem & Govt. are requested therefore that the President of the District Board may be instructed immediately to promote Sub Inspectors who are drawing a salary of Rs 60 and above and to submit suitable proposals accordingly.

13 Since draft for the above communication from the Dy Comr has been

Serial No.

been received.

It appeared a copy of the Dy Comrs present letter will be sent to the President, Dist Board and with a request that modified proposals as indicated by the Dy Comr may be made.

7590/1871

Lb 19/1/27

Lb Dist Members Madras. 23/1/27

Lb 1/cs

Lee 19/1

SA 19.1.

Draft attached for signature today

W 19/1

Lb Draft as submitted

Lb 21/1/27

Lb Done W 20/1

4a Letter No. L4751/3 21.1.27 to the President, Dist Board of Bangalore.

Forwarded a copy of H.O.S. and requests that in the circumstances stated, to arrange to forward only such of the Sanr Inspectors as are drawing a pay of Rs 60/- and below and to submit modified proposals accordingly.

Asin

32292

'Extract from the First Member's remarks dated the 19th January 1927, from the File re. Mr. D. Venkatesaiya's letter on the New District Boards.

---

x x x

Against point 4. Pay of Panchayet Inspectors.

I am afraid personal allowance may not b allowed by Financial Secretariat.

2. Board has thrown out some men on Rs.80/-. Local Fund Department is asking him to throw out men drawing smaller pay It should be made clear that pay should be -- nearest Rs.60/-, neither too much above nor below.

3. After these orders are ratified by New District Boards, Deputy Commissioners may be asked to absorb in other vacancies those who suffer loss; and if they are particularly fitted for Village Panchayet work to propose personal allowance in rare cases. This draft should go in consultation with Financial --- Secretariat.

Minutes Remarks Dated 21.1.27 in file No 3148 Rx - Pay Inspectors in Panchayats

Approved.

I hope orders have issued to all Deputy Commissioners and Presidents as suggested in another File that as far as possible Inspectors drawing more than Rs.60/- should be retained and not discharged and thos getting nearest Rs.60/- discharged for being appointed Panchayet Inspectors.

Acc. Circular letter on the above lines is issued to-day.

7762 22/1/27

24/1/27

23 First Member

24/1/27

23/1/27

Serial No.

43 Letter No. L4849-66 & 25.1.27 to the President Dist Board.

Requests that, in view of the fact that the pay of the Panchayat Inspectors under the V.P. Scheme has been fixed at Rs 60 plus Rs 15 per mensem, request them to retain in the services of the Dist Board of the Govt Inspectors as are drawing a salary that is much more than Rs 60/- per mensem, namely those in receipt of a pay of Rs mensem Rs 60/- being discharged for appointment as Panchayat Inspectors.

47 Do Letter No. C. 825/26-27 & 29.1.27 from the President, Dist Bd of Bangalore.

Submits modified proposals regarding names of the Govt Inspectors to be transferred for being appointed Village Panchayat Inspectors.

The proposals as modified stand as follows:-

Original	Modified
1 Mr. M. Hanumanthaiya Rs 67/-	Mr. C. Gowrishankar Rs 55
2 " C. Chengalaraya Reddy Rs 57/-	" B. Krishnamurthy Rs.
3 " M. Varada Rao, Rs 72/-	" M. Varada Rao Rs 72
4 " M. Ramalingaraju Rs 59	" M. Ramalingaraju Rs 59/-
5. " S. Veerunnabhiappa, Rs 51/-	" S. Veerunnabhiappa, Rs 51/-

27 The Joint Members orders on the President's Dl " L. L. Secy. may be approved. V. Rao may be told that he should get only Rs 60/- and would be next

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26
App. F. III—2]

35-26A

General and Revenue Secretariat | L/S File No. 25 of 1926

Serial No.

must have if he proves useless as V. P. Inspector

(AA) Ke
29/1/27

8/45
31/1

2 Draft sanctioning the modified proposals of the President is submitted for approval.

Ke
31/1/27 of Asst Secretary

30 Appd. Jain Race Rajus pay. If his more than 60 include him also in draft with V.Rao

Ke
31/1

31 Asst. Ramalingaraju's pay being only Rs 59, his pay as V. P. Inspector need not be fixed in the draft.

Ke
1/2/27

32 Done above

50 G.O. No. L 5265-7 of 31.1.27 to the President, Bd of Rev, Comptr and Rev Commr.

Sanctions the appointment of certain Sanit Inspectors as Veterinary Pharmacist Inspectors with certain observations.

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26.
App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | LB File No. 25 of 1926

Serial No.	
64	Letter No C-2-318/26-27 dt 4.2.27 from the Dy Comr, Bangalore Dist. States that, as both Messrs Varada Rao and Ramalingaraja cannot be taken as Panchayet Inspectors, as they are proven condemned useless as Sanr Inspectors and that has posted Messrs C. Chengalraya Naidu and R. Ramachandriah have been appointed Panchayet Inspectors in place of Messrs Varada Rao and Ramalingaraja who have been directed to continue as Sanr Inspectors, subject to the approval of Govt. 33 The Dy Comr, Bangalore District has ~~reported~~ submitted vide C.O of his 31st Jan 1927 appointing Mr. Varada Rao as Village Panchayet Inspector on a reduced pay and Mr. Ramalinga-raja as such on the ground that ~~they cannot be taken as Panchayet Inspectors~~ they are found useless as Sanr Inspectors. 34 He says that, as Mr. Varada Rao was drawing a salary of Rs 72/- and as his last increment of Rs 5/- being sanctioned by the President himself so recently as 20th Jan 1927, it would not be fair to get a Sanr Inspector of long service who has earned his increments would be put to undue hardship and be discharged at an advanced stage in his service when it will be very hard for him to take to other avocations,

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

3670L

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-2

General and Revenue Secretariat | L/B File No. 25 of 1926

Serial No.

35 Dy Secy wants Messrs C. Chengalraya Naidu, Rs 57 and M. Ramachendriah, Rs 53/- may be relieved of their duties as Sanr Inspectors for being appointed as Panchayat Inspectors in lieu of Messrs Varada Rao and Ramalengaraju who have been confirmed by the President, but who have been directed by him to continue as Sanr Inspectors subject to the approval of Govt.

36 Mr Varada Rao has to be relieved to Rs 60/- as Panchayat Inspector, his Service Register may have to be sent for perhaps and the opinion of the Presidents of Salem Boards under whom he served may have also to be called for before passing final orders in the matter.

37 As regards selection of men as Panchayat Inspectors, clear instructions have been issued in this office circular letter No L 5210-257 L.B. II-26-1 dt 31st Jan 1927.

M

Submitted for orders.

7/4/27 38 [illegible]

8385/7/27

The D.C's proposals may be sanctioned temporarily pending the decision of the new Dt Board. & D.C requested that one of the new Board also decide to discharge these two men he and

see to be taken up with D.C. Hope he disposes with them if found unsatisfy. Copy to Dept.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet 8/2

WD 01229—GPB—37,500—1-9-26

General and Revenue Secretariat | L.B File No. 25 of 1926

Serial No.

Draft is sent for approval.

9/2/27

S/2

C.W.O. Please sign

Sheet

9/2/27

RR 12/2

1/2

56 C.O.No. 2509-A.G. 15.2.27 to the Dy. Com^r, Bangalore Dt.

Sanctions the proposal of the Dy. Com^r pending the decision of the Dist. Board in the matter and cancels the appointment of Messrs Varada Das and Ramchandra Raje as Panchayat Inspectors with the observation that, if the Dist. Board decide to discharge these two men, the Dy. Com^r may try them as Panchayat Inspectors and that if found unsatisfactory, dispense with their services.

40363

No.C-318/26-27 Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District,
Dated, Bangalore the 7th January 1927.

From
S. Hiriannaiya, Esq., M.A., B.L.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District. Bangalore. 11 2990a

GEN. & REV. SECTT.
Fr. L
10. JAN. 1927
G. D. SECTION.

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-Law,
Secretary to Government of Mysore,
Local and Legislative Departments,
Bangalore.

Sir,

B 25-26-35

With reference to paragraph 6 of Government Order No.L.3059-124/L.B.25-26-14 dated the 12th November 1926 re. the forwarding of a list of District Board and Taluk Board employees to be thrown out from the 1st of February 1927, and Government Order No.L.3686-704/L.B.119-26-1 dated the 10th December 1926 directing the employment of thrown-out Sanitary Inspectors and L.F.clerks as village Panchayat Inspectors and clerks, I have the honour to state that I have not received any reply from the President, Bangalore District Board who was requested to forward definite proposals in the matter, as early as practicable. It is also ascertained that the meeting of the District Board which was proposed to be held on the 29th ultimo was adjourned.

2. As the working of the new District Board Regulation devolves on the Board to be constituted hereafter, it is perhaps better to leave the question of retrenchment to be finally decided by the new District Board. In the circumstances, I request the favour of instructions whether, pending the decision of the new District Board, the Deputy Commissioner may make temporary arrangements for the work of clerks and village Panchayat Inspectors.

3. I solicit early orders of Government.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DISTRICT.

40633

14

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.
BANGALORE DISTRICT BOARD.

No. 525/26-27

Bangalore 8th January 1927.



From

B. ABDUR RAHMON, ESQ., B.A.,
PRESIDENT, DISTRICT BOARD,
BANGALORE.

To

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-Law,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness the
Maharaja of Mysore, Local & Legislative Departments,
Bangalore.
(THROUGH THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, BANGALORE DISTRICT.)

SIR,

Adverting to para 6 of Government Order No.L.3059-124/L.B. 25-26-14 dated 12th November 1926, regarding the Minimum staff required for the New District Board and directing to take timely steps to discharge the remaining staff at the end of the term of the Board, etc., I have the honour to state that the matter was placed before the Finance Committee and a copy of their resolution is herein enclosed for kind perusal. In order to place the subject before the District Board, a meeting had been called for on the 29th Ultimo, but it was adjourned for want of quorum.

2. However the matter will be placed before the next District Board meeting. In the meanwhile the Taluk Board Presidents have been requested to issue notices of discharge to the following staff and the fact has been intimated to the Deputy Commissioner.

1. Sanitary Inspectors: (1) Mr. Ramalinga Raju of Hosakote Taluk
(2) " M.Hanumantha Rao of Devanahally"
3) " C. Changalaraya Naidu of Dodballapur Tal
4) " M.Varda Rao of Kankanhalli Taluk
5) " S. Vairmidyappa of Chennapatna "

11. Local Fund Clerks of all the Taluks.

111. Local Fund Attendars: (1) Ramaswamiah of Bangalore Taluk
(2) Venkata Rao of Hosakote "
(3) Ramiah of Devanahally "
(4) Sreekantiah of Magady "

1V. All the peons of ten taluks (provisionally) of these seven will be retained afterwards.

192 —2

From

THE PRESIDENT,

BANGALORE DISTRICT BOARD.

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

15

3. Proposition statement and proposals for the minimum staff required under the District Board will be submitted soon after the District Board meets.

4. I request that the Government may be pleased to issue orders for the entertainment of the officials to be discharged from 1st. February 1927, so that there may be no break of Service.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

B A Rahimon

President, District Board,
Bangalore District.

Forwarded with compliments

Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

Proceedings of the Finance Committee meeting held on the 7th December'27.

=====

Members present:

Mr. A. Hayes,
" Niligiri G. Sanjeevayya.
" S.N.M. Razvi
" B. Sreenivasa Iyengar.

===

Read G.O. No.L.3059-124/L.B.25-26-14 dated 12th November 1926 calling for the information as to the minimum staff required for the New District Board after re-constitution.

Resolved that the lists of retentions and reductions may be submitted to District Board as passed this day.

(1) That all the clerks in Taluk Board Offices together with the five Sanitary Inspectors and four Attendars and three peons should be provided for in the Panchayet Scheme. The list will be as follows as per revised scale already proposed and existing:-

Retentions

Name of Taluk.	Sanitary Inspector.	Attender.	Peon.	Vaccinator. (existing hands)
1.Bangalore.	1	1	1	2
2.Kankanhalli.	1	1	1	2
3 Anekal & Hosakote	1	1	1	2
4.Devanahalli & Dodballapur	1	1	1	4
5.Nelamangala & Magady	1	1	1	4
6.Closepet & Chennapatna	1	1	1	2
7.District Reserve	1	1	1	1

District Board Establishment.

1.Head Clerk
2.Deputy Clerk for Cash Accounts
3.3rd Clerk for Maramat
4.4th Clerk for accounts.
5.5th Clerk for Vital Statistics,Epidemic and Miscellaneous
6.6th Clerk for Board Meeting and to assist in correspondence
7.7th Clerk for Despatcher.
8.8th Clerk Record Keeper.
9. 9th Clerk Typist.

The officials to be merged on reduction may not suffer in emoluments.

That in face of these changes the Committee is of opinion that a separate Agency is required to carry out all Maramat and recommends the same to the Board.

xx xx xx

"Extract"

B.K.Kalmon

President,District Board,
Bangalore District.

40334

No. C 525/26-27

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.
BANGALORE DISTRICT BOARD.

Bangalore 8th January 1927.

29892

From

B. ABDUR RAHMON, ESQ., B.A.,
PRESIDENT, DISTRICT BOARD,
BANGALORE.

GEN. & REV. SECTT. BR 10 JAN. 1927 G. D. SECTION.

To

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-Law,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Local & Legis-
lative Departments, Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of letter addressed to Government through the Deputy Commissioner, for favour of information.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

B. A. Rahmon

President, District Board,
Bangalore District.

192 —2:

From

THE PRESIDENT,

BANGALORE DISTRICT BOARD.

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

18

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.
BANGALORE DISTRICT BOARD.

No.

Bangalore 8th January 1927.

From

B. ABDUR RAHMON, ESQ., B.A.,
PRESIDENT, DISTRICT BOARD,
BANGALORE.

To

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-Law,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Local & Legislative Departments, Bangalore.
(THROUGH THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, BANGALORE DISTRICT.)

SIR,

Adverting to para 6 of Government Order No.L.3059-124/L.B. 25-26-14 dated 12th November 1926, regarding the Minimum staff required for the New District Board and directing to take timely steps to discharge the remaining staff at the end of the term of the Board, etc.,I have the honour to state that the matter was placed before the Finance Committee and a copy of their resolution is herein enclosed for kind perusal. In order to place the subject before the District Board, a meeting had been called for on the 29th Ultimo, but it was adjourned for want of quorum.

2. However the matter will be placed before the next District Board meeting. In the meanwhile the Taluk Board Presidents have been requested to issue notices of discharge to the following staff and the fact has been intimated to the Deputy Commissioner.

I. Sanitary Inspectors: (1) Mr. Ramalinga Raju of Hosakote Taluk
(2) " M.Hanumantha Rao of Devanahally"
(3) " C. Changalaraya Naidu of Dodballapur Talu
(4) " M.Varda Rao of Kankanhalli Taluk
(5) " S. Vairmidyappa of Chennapatna "

II. Local Fund Clerks of all the Taluks.

III. Local Fund Attendars: (1) Ramaswamiah of Bangalore Taluk
(2) Venkata Rao of Hosakote "
(3) Ramiah of Devanahally "
(4) Sreekantiah of Magady "

IV. All the peons of ten taluks (provisionally) of these seven will be retained afterwards.

3. Proposition statement and proposals for the minimum staff required under the District Board will be submitted soon after the District Board meets.

4. I request that the Government may be pleased to issue orders for the entertainment of the officials to be discharged from 1st. February 1927, so that there may be no break of Service.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Sd/- B. Abdur Rahmon,
President, District Board,
Bangalore District.

"C O P Y"

B A Rahmon

President, District Board,
Bangalore District.

Proceedings of the Finance Committee meeting held on the 7th December'27.

Members present:

Mr. A. Hayes,
" Niligiri G. Sanjeevayya.
" S.N.M. Razvi
" B. Sreenivasa Iyengar.

Read G.O. No.L.3059-124/L.B.25-26-14 dated 12th November 1926 calling for the information as to the minimum staff required for the New District Board after re-constitution.

Resolved that the lists of retentions and reductions may be submitted to District Board as passed this day.

(1) That all the clerks in Taluk Board Offices together with the five Sanitary Inspectors and four Attendars and three peons should be provided for in the Panchayet Scheme. The list will be as follows as per revised scale already proposed and existing:-

Name of Taluk.	Sanitary Inspector.	Attender.	Peon.	Vaccinator. (existing hands)
1.Bangalore.	1	1	1	2
2.Kankanhalli.	1	1	1	2
3 Anekal & Hosakote	1	1	1	2
4.Devanahalli & Dodballapur	1	1	1	4
5.Nelamangala & Magady	1	1	1	4
6.Closepet & Chennapatna	1	1	1	2
7.District Reserve	1	1	1	1

District Board Establishment.

1.Head Clerk
2.Deputy Clerk for Cash Accounts
3.3rd Clerk for Maramat
4.4th Clerk for accounts.
5.5th Clerk for Vital Statistics,Epidemic and Miscellaneous
6.6th Clerk for Board Meeting and to assist in correspondence
7.7th Clerk for Despatcher.
8.8th Clerk Record Keeper
9. 9th Clerk Typist.

The officials to be merged on reduction may not suffer in emoluments.

That in face of these changes the Committee is of opinion that a separate Agency is required to carry out all Maramat and recommends the same to the Board.

xx xx xx

"Extract"

President,District Board,
Bangalore District.

1162

21

C2-318/26-27

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District,
Bangalore, Dated the 17th January 1927.

LB. 25-26-27

REVENUE SECT.
3188
18. JAN. 1927
31384

From

S. Hirianniah, Esqr., M.A., B.L.,

Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

GEN. & REV. SECTT.
18. JAN. 1927
G. D. SECTION

To

B. Nagappa, Esqr., Bar-at-law.,

Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

Local and Legislative Departments, Bangalore.

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No. C2-318/26-27 dated the 10th January 1927 and with reference to Bangalore District Board President's letter No. 525/26-27 dated the 8th January 1927 re: the retrenchment in the establishment of Taluk Boards from the 1st February 1927, I have the honor to state that it is ascertained that some of the sanitary Inspectors who are proposed to be thrown out are drawing higher salary than Rs60/- per mensem. There are no vacancies to absorb them on their present salary, and they cannot be appointed as village Panchayet Inspectors as the pay of the latter is fixed at Rs60/- per mensem by Government,

I therefore request that Government may be pleased to issue definite instructions immediately to the President, Bangalore District Board to throw out sanitary Inspectors who are drawing a salary of Rs60/- and below. In these hard days I think that as little hardship as possible should be caused to officials whose appointments are to be abolished. This principle is also in consonance with the resolution of the Finance Committee which has already been submitted to Government I am also requesting the President, Bangalore District Board to forward modified proposals in the matter.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Yourmost obedient servant

For Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

APP. F. VI. Gl.]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section L.B

File No. 25-21

Serial No 40

Diary No. of letter replied to 29904

No. L 4751/Estate

To

General and Revenue Secretariat
(L.S.S)
the *192*

The President, Dist Board
of Bangalore.
~~Asst Secy to Govt, Bangalore~~

Date of issue 21st Jan 27

Signed by Asst S.S.

Sir,

With ref. to your letter No 525/26-27 G dt 8th Jan 1927 ~~forwarding~~ submitting proposals regarding the minimum staff required for the by the New District Boards, I am directed to forward herewith a copy of letter No C. 2-3187/26-27 G dt 17th Jan 1927 from the Dy Comr, Bangalore Dist and to observe that some of the Taluq Inspectors who are at present to be thrown out are said to be drawing higher salary than Rs 60/-

over

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

250

H

or Inverness and that there are no vacancies to absorb them on their present salary nor can they even be appointed as Village Panchayat Inspectors as the maximum of the latter is fixed at Rs 60/-

per mensem by Govt:

I am therefore to request you to be so good as to submit alternate modified proposals so as to work out only such of the Sanct Inspectorships as are drawing a pay of Rs 60/- & below so as to enable Govt to absorb them in the Village Panchayat Scheme.

arrange to work out only such of the said Inspectorships as are drawing a pay of Rs 60/- & below & submit modified proposals accordingly immediately

I have &c

Lt. Col.

Memo No. L 4752

Copy to the Secy Panchayat Dept. with reference to his letter No. C. 2-318/26-27 dt 17.1.27

By order

Lt. Col.

24/1/27

No.L4849-56/ L&S 25-26-4: 24

To 20/25th Jan 29

Compl

The Presidents of District Boards.

S i r,

In view of the fact that the pay of the Panchayet Inspectors under the Village Panchayet Scheme has been fixed at Rs.60/- plus 15/- per mensem, I am directed to request you to be so good as to retain in the service of the District Board ~~only~~ such of the Sanitary Inspectors as are drawing a salary that is much more than Rs.60/- per mensem only those in receipt of a pay of or nearest to Rs.60/- (i.e., neither too much above nor below Rs.60/-) being discharged for appointment as Panchayet Inspectors. ~~Of~~ ~~Orders to be passed may kindly~~ Orders have already been passed discharging two persons that is either much below or much above Rs.60, they may kindly be revised as above ~~so as to~~ in order to ~~secure~~ bring the pay as nearly as possible to Rs.60/- and avoid extra cost to Government as well as to ~~save~~ spare the discontent of the persons concerned.

I have etc.,

Secy to Govt.
L.&.L.Deptts.

Memo No. L.

Copy of the above is forwarded, with compliments to the Deputy Commissioners of Districts for information.

By Order,

Secretary to Govt.
L.L.Departments.

25/1/29

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BANGALORE DISTRICT BOARD.

(CONFIDENTIAL)
No C.525/26-27.

Bangalore, 28th January 1927.

25

Lr 25-26-43

Reference:- Government Order (Confidential) No.L.4849-56/L.B.25-26-43 dated 25th January 1927, and letter No.C.2-318/26-27 dated 25th January 1927:
=====

GENERAL REVENUE SECRETARIAT
29 JAN 1927
3409
LOCAL SELF GOVT. BRANCH

Dear Sir,

The names, salaries and service of the five Sanitary Inspectors to whom notices of discharge have been served are given in the margin. Of these only two draw more salary than Rs.60/-

1. S. Vairamudiappa, 11 years. Rs.51/-
2. C. Chengalraya Naidu, 19 years. Rs.57/-
3. K. Ramalinga Raju. 18½ years. Rs.59/-
4. M. Varada Rao, 18 years. Rs.67/- plus Rs.5/- increment sanctioned on 20th January 1927.
5. M. Hanumantha Rao, 16 years. Rs.65/-.

Messrs. (1) Hanumantha Rao, (2) Ramalingaraju and (3) Varada Rao had been taken as Deputy Inspectors of Vaccination and having served there as such for several years were reverted as Sanitary Inspectors in the year 1922. During these years naturally they had lost the touch with the sanitary work, and had become almost useless for such work. They were drawing a salary of Rs.55/- when they were reverted. They petitioned the Government and the District Board to consider their case as other Sanitary Inspectors, who continued as such were drawing more pay than they were doing. The Board after long consideration resolved to pay the salary they would have got if they had continued in the sanitary line and thus they got their salaries enhanced and their pay was brought on a par with

the other Sanitary Inspectors, though they did not actually work in the Department. But unfortunately as they had lost touch with the works that Sanitary Inspectors are required to attend to, they proved themselves to be unfit for this sort of work. It was possible to extract some work by putting pressure only from Mr. Hanumantha Rao, but even then the progress is very small. Till today it was not possible to extract any good work from the other two Messrs. Ramalinga Raju and Varada Rao. Their horse allowances had been stopped, and their increment rolls were withheld owing to their negligence, inattentiveness and want of technical knowledge. Mr.Ramalinga Raju worked for sometime in Bangalore Taluk. Mr: A.J. Donne the then Taluk Board President, complained about his work and in the end refused to keep him any longer. Then I transferred him to Magady Taluk where he did not remain more than a few months. I received a strong complaint from there also, and I had to transfer him to Hosakote Taluk, from where I am receiving complaints even today. As no other Taluk Board President wanted him and as I could not get rid of him by any other means, but dismissal, I stopped his horse allowance for a number of months and similarly his increment. The Horse allowance was sanctioned very recently as the Taluk Board pleaded that he would suffer a heavy loss, if this is not sanctioned at this stage, when his services have to be transferred to other Department.

There is a similar story to repeat of Mr. Varada Rao. He was working in Chennapatna Taluk. He had to be transferred to Nelamangala Taluk, where he

remained only for a few months, and from there he had to be transferred to Kankanhalli Taluk, where also he has proved useless. His horse allowance and increment had been stopped. First I sanctioned only one year's increment for him, who then represented that his increment has to be sanctioned bi-annually. Then unwillingly, I had to sanction the same very recently i.e.. on 20th January 1927, as I thought he would suffer, and purely as an act of sympathy. Again he has sent in his increment for one year, day before yesterday, on the plea that he would not get even that, if he becomes a Panchayet Inspector. He did not want one year's increment to be sanctioned as it is bi-annual and now in his own interest he has sent in his one year increment on a different plea. This clearly goes to show. how careful he is in getting his own salary enhanced without caring for any rules,etc.

The work that Messrs. Ramalinga Raju and Varda Rao have turned out in their respective Taluks is so meagre that I feel it disgraceful to mention. Their existence in the Taluks was quite useless, and it is my candid opinion that they will never be useful to the Taluks as Sanitary Inspectors. Both of them have proved to be unfit for sanitary and other works connected with Taluk Boards. During the time they have worked in Hosakote and Kankanhalli Taluks, they have estimated for a very few well works or for any other works. These two taluks on account of these two officials have suffered a great deal in not getting done any sanitary and improvement

works. Thinking that they would be useful to the Panchayets as Panchayet Inspectors, I ordered that notices may be served on them, as there is notmuch technical work to be done there, but only organising work. If they are continued as Sanitary Inspectors I am sure their progress will not only suffer, but they will prove to be a burden on the District funds and those Taluks to which these will be placed in charge will be unfortunate, and there will be no sort of progress, as each Sanitary Inspector has to work in a circle of two Taluks in future I would have been the last man to have come to this conclusion, had it not been for the sad experience I have had of their work

The only Sanitary Inspector that would suffer would be Mr. Varada Rao. He was drawing a salary of Rs.55/- till the year 1922, and he got his promotions due on his transfer to this Department from the Vaccination Department, as he did not get any promotion as Deputy Inspector of Vaccination. He was drawing Rs.67/- till 20th January 1927 and he got his increment sanctioned only on 20th January 1927 on the plea of his going away from this Department.

So far about my actual experience of the officials to whom notices have been served. But since the Government desire that the proposals may be revised, I may with hesitation retain Mr.M.Hanumantha Rao (one of the two drawing more than Rs.60/-) and send C. Thiramalachar (Rs.55/-) in his place. But my experience does not permit me to go behind

my orders to retain Messrs. M. Varada Rao and Ramalinga Raju under the District Board. It is not that I want to harm them, but that no good work could be extracted from them without constant pressure which is not possible after the abolition of the Taluk Boards. I very much resent to make mention of these facts but have to do so in the interest of District Board work.

After the submission of the proposals, the President of the Bangalore Taluk Board informed me that he wants to retain Mr.B. Krishnaswamy Mudaliar under him as Village Panchayet Inspector in view of his experience in the Taluk and has made a recommendation to Deputy Commissioner also in the matter. I will have no objection to accede to his request and allow Mr.B.Krishnaswamy Mudaliar to be appointed as Village Panchayet Inspector in the Bangalore Taluk, and take back Mr. C. Chengalaraya Naidu in his stead.

The modified proposals stand as follows:-

ORIGINAL	MODIFIED
1. Mr.M. Hanumantha Rao, Rs.67/-	Mr. C. Tirumalachar Rs.55/-
2. " C. Chengalaraya Naidu. Rs.57/-	" B. Krishnaswamy Mudaliar Rs.53/-
3. " M. Varada Rao. Rs.72/-	" M. Varada Rao Rs.72/-
4. "M.Ramalingaraju Rs.59/-	" M. Ramalinga Raju Rs.59/-
5. " S. Vairumudiappa Rs.51/-	" S. Vairumudiappa. Rs.51/-

Except Mr. M. Varada Rao all others are drawing below Rs.60/-. All the five could be appointed as Village Panchayet Inspectors. The interest of the ~~Taluk~~ Board cannot be made to suffer

for the sake of one official who has proved to be useless.

I may be permitted to observe that the other District Boards have served notices of discharge to almost all the Sanitary Inspectors under them, of whom there may be many who are drawing a salary more than Rs.60/-. So. I leave the matter in the hands of the Government to very kindly consider the question.

I would suggest that the posts of the remaining Village Panchayet Inspectors in the District may not be permanently filled up till the proposal re: the staff entertained by this District Board is ratified by the new District Board.

I may be excused for this lengthy letter.

Yours sincerely,

B A Ralmon

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-LAW,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Local and
Legislative Departments, BANGALORE

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.
BANGALORE DISTRICT BOARD.

(CONFIDENTIAL)
No.C.525/26-27.

Bangalore, 28th January 192 .

35-26

29. JAN 1927

Reference:- Government Order (Confidential) No.L.4849-56/L.B.25-26-43 dated 25th January 1927, and letter No.C.2-318/26-27 dated 25th January 1927:

Dear Sir,

The names, salaries and service of the five Sanitary Inspectors to whom notices of discharge have been served are given in the margin. Of these only two draw more salary than Rs.60/-

1. S. Vairamudiappa, 11 years. Rs.51/-	
2. C. Chengalraya Naidu, 19 years. Rs.57/-	
3. K. Ramalinga Raju, 18½years. Rs.59/-	
4. M. Varada Rao, 18 years. Rs.67/- plus Rs.5/- increment sanctioned on 20th January 1927.	
5. M. Hanumantha Rao, 16 years. Rs.65/-.	

Messrs. (1) Hanumantha Rao, (2) Ramalingaraju and (3) Varada Rao had been taken as Deputy Inspectors of Vaccination and having served there as such for several years were reverted as Sanitary Inspectors in the year 1922. During these years naturally they had lost the touch with the sanitary work, and had become almost useless for such work. They were drawing a salary of Rs.55/- when they were reverted. They petitioned the Government and the District Board to consider their case as other Sanitary Inspectors, who continued as such were drawing more pay than they were doing. The Board after long consideration resolved to pay the salary they would have got if they had continued in the sanitary line and thus they got their salaries enhanced and their pay was brought on a par with

the other Sanitary Inspectors, though they did not actually work in the Department. But unfortunately as they had lost touch with the works that Sanitary Inspectors are required to attend to, they proved themselves to be unfit for this sort of work It was possible to extract some work by putting pressur only from Mr. Hanumantha Rao, but even then the progress is very small. Till today it was not possible to extract any good work from the other two Messrs. Ramalinga Raju and Varada Rao. Their horse allowances had been stopped, and their increment rolls were withheld owing to their negligence, inattentiveness and want of technical knowledge. Mr.Ramalinga Raju worked for sometime in Bangalore Taluk. Mr. A.J. Donne the then Taluk Board President, complained about his work and in the end refused to keep him any longer. Then I transferred him to Magady Taluk where he did not remain more than a few months. I received a strong complaint from there also, and I had to transfer him to Hosakote Taluk. from where I am receiving complaints even today. As no other Taluk Board President wanted him and as I could not get rid of him by any other means, but dismissal, I stopped his horse allowance for a number of months and similarly his increment. The Horse allowance was sanctioned very recently as the Taluk Board pleaded that he would suffer a heavy loss, if this is not sanctioned at this stage, when his services have to be transferred to other Department.

There is a similar story to repeat of Mr. Varada Rao. He was working in Chennapatna Taluk He had to be transferred to Nelamangala Taluk, where he

remained only for a few months, and from there he had to be transferred to Kankanhalli Taluk, where also he has proved useless. His horse allowance and increment had been stopped. First I sanctioned only one year's increment for him, who then represented that his increment has to be sanctioned bi-annually. Then unwillingly, I had to sanction the same very recently i.e., on 20th January 1927, as I thought he would suffer, and purely as an act of sympathy. Again he has sent in his increment for one year, day before yesterday, on the plea that he would not get even that, if he becomes a Panchayet Inspector. He did not want one year's increment to be sanctioned as it is bi-annual and now in his own interest he has sent in his one year increment on a different plea. This clearly goes to show, how careful he is in getting his own salary enhanced without caring for any rules,etc.

The work that Messrs. Ramalinga Raju and Varda Rao have turned out in their respective Taluks is so meagre that I feel it disgraceful to mention. Their existence in the Taluks was quite useless, and it is my candid opinion that they will never be useful to the Taluks as Sanitary Inspectors. Both of them have proved to be unfit for sanitary and other works connected with Taluk Boards. During the time they have worked in Hosakote and Kankanhalli Taluks, they have estimated for a very few well works or for any other works. These two taluks on account of these two officials have suffered a great deal in not getting done any sanitary and improvement

works. Thinking that they would be useful to the Panchayets as Panchayet Inspectors, I ordered that notices may be served on them, as there is not much technical work to be done there, but only organising work. If they are continued as Sanitary Inspectors I am sure their progress will not only suffer, but they will prove to be a burden on the District funds and those Taluks to which these will be placed in charge will be unfortunate, and there will be no sort of progress, as each Sanitary Inspector has to work in a circle of two Taluks in future. I would have been the last man to have come to this conclusion, had it not been for the sad experience I have had of their work.

The only Sanitary Inspector that would suffer would be Mr. Varada Rao. He was drawing a salary of Rs.55/- till the year 1922, and he got his promotions due on his transfer to this Department from the Vaccination Department, as he did no get any promotion as Deputy Inspector of Vaccination. He was drawing Rs.67/- till 20th January 1927 and he got his increment sanctioned only on 20th January 1927 on the plea of his going away from this Department.

So far about my actual experience of the officials to whom notices have been served. But since the Government desire that the proposals may be revised, I may with hesitation retain Mr.M.Hanumantha Rao (one of the two drawing more than Rs.60/-) and send C. Thiramalachar (Rs.55/-) in his place. But my experience does not permit me to go behind

3574 S

my orders to retain Messrs. M. Varada Rao and Ramalinga Raju under the District Board. It is not that I want to harm them, but that no good work could be extracted from them without constant pressure which is not possible after the abolition of the Taluk Boards. I very much resent to make mention of these facts but have to do so in the interest of District Board work.

After the submission of the proposals, the President of the Bangalore Taluk Board informed me that he wants to retain Mr.B. Krishnaswamy Mudaliar under him as Village Panchayet Inspector in view of his experience in the Taluk and has made a recommendation to Deputy Commissioner also in the matter. I will have no objection to accede to his request and allow Mr.B.Krishnaswamy Mudaliar to be appointed as Village Panchayet Inspector in the Bangalore Taluk,and take back Mr. C. Chengalaraya Naidu - in his stead.

The modified proposals stand as follows:-

ORIGINAL	MODIFIED
1. Mr.M. Hanumantha Rao, Rs.67/-	Mr. C. Tirumalachar Rs.55/-
2. " C. Chengalaraya Naidu. Rs.57/-	" B. Krishnaswamy ~~Naidu~~ Mudaliar Rs.53/-
3. " M. Varada Rao. Rs.72/-	" M. Varada Rao Rs.72/-
4. "M.Ramalingaraju Rs.59/-	" M. Ramalinga Raju Rs.59/-
5. " S. Vairumudiappa Rs.51/-	" S. Vairumudiappa. Rs.51/-

Except Mr. M. Varada Rao all others are drawing below Rs.60/-. All the five could be appointed as Village Panchayet Inspectors. The interest of the ~~Taluk~~ Board cannot be made to suffer

for the sake of one official who has proved to be useless.

I may be permitted to observe that the other District Boards have served notices of discharge to almost all the Sanitary Inspectors under them, of whom there may be many who are drawing a salary more than Rs.60/-. So, I leave the matter in the hands of the Government to very kindly consider the question.

I would suggest that the posts of the remaining Village Panchayet Inspectors in the District may not be permanently filled up till the proposal re: the staff entertained by this District Board is ratified by the new District Board.

I may be excused for this lengthy letter.

Yours sincerely,

B.A. Ralimore

K. Chandy, Esq., B.A.,
First Member of Council,
Bangalore

W

27

G.R..S VI G 34]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to... 35261

Section 43

File No. 25-26

Serial No. 50

General and Revenue Secretariat

(L.S.G)

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

the *192*

Date of issue 3/8th June/1927

Signed by ekr J. K.S

Read— Para 6 of G.O.No L 3059-LB 25-26-165 dtd 12th Nov 1926 regarding the District Boards to submit proposals regarding the minimum staff of the each present District Taluk Boards including the Sanitary Inspectors to be required sufficient for the efficient discharge of the duties devolving on the new District Boards and to take timely steps to discharge the remaining staff at the end of the term of the Board.

~~Order Thereon No.~~

2 G.O.No L 3686-704/L.B 119-15 dtd 20th Dec 1926 sanctioning the appointment of an Inspector

May this be

i Printed ?

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

shayets on Rs. 60 plus Rs 15/- (House rent) per mensem and a clerk on Rs. 30/- in the case of Taluks and Rs 20 in case of Sub-Taluks per mensem at the end of June 1927 and ~~wait~~ for proposals from in regard to these appointments from with instructions the Deputy Commissioners of Districts to retrench services of such qualified Sanitary Inspectors and Clerks as are likely to be thrown out of employment consequent upon the abolition of Taluk Boards and the curtailment of establishments in the District Boards ~~and asking for~~

3. Letter No C.2-318/26-27 dated the 9th Jan 1927 from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore, stating that he has not received any reply from the President, District Board Bangalore to forward definite proposals in the matter and suggesting that, pending working of the new District Board and decisions on the Board to be constituted hereafter, it would be better to leave the question of retrenchment to be finally decided by the new District Board.

4. Letter No 525/26-27 dated the 9th Jan 1927 from the President, District Board Bangalore, ~~submitting proposals~~ stating that the Presidents of Taluk Boards have been requested to issue notices of change to the ~~permanent~~ temporary staff and the same have been intimated to the Deputy Commissioner and requesting proposals for the minimum staff required under the new District Board will be submitted soon after the Board meeting

List of enclosures:

I. Sanitary Inspectors (1) Mr. Ramalingaswamy of Hoskote Taluk
2) Mr. M. Hanumantha Rao of Devanahalli
3) " C. Changalaraya Naidu of Doddaballapur
4) " K. Varada Rao of Kankanhalli Taluk
5) S. Varamundiappa of Channapatna

II L. F. Clerks of the all the Taluks

III L. F. Attenders (1) Ramamurthy of Bangalore Taluk
(2) Venkatappa of Hoskote
3) Ramiah of Devanahalli

Copied by

Examined by

G. K. S. G/53]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

1. M. S. Varadarajappa, Rs 51/- and
2. Ramalinga Raju on 57 do
3. M. Varada Rao on 72 do
B. Krishnaswamy Mudaliar on Rs 53 do
C. Tirumalachar 57 do

5 Correspondence ending with letter No. C. 525/26-7 dt. 28th Jan. 1927 from the President, District Board of ~~in reply to~~ notification of his previous proposals stating that Instructs ~~have~~ been discharge ~~of~~ have been given on the marginally noted Sam. Inspectors ~~and have~~ for being appointed as Panchayat Inspectors on Rs 60 plus Rs 15/- a month with effect from the 1st Feb. 1927, and stating that the work of Messrs Ramalinga Raju and Varada Rao as Sam. Inspectors ~~are~~ is far from satisfactory and that both of them will never be useful to the talukas as Sam. Inspects

order No. 45265-7

The modified proposals of the President are sanctioned with the observation that the pay of M. Varada Rao, as Panchayat Inspector will be fixed at Rs 60 plus Rs 15 H.A. and that he ~~will be sent home~~ as may be found fit

V Mr R Raju may be informed

WD 2230—GPB—1,00,000—23-7-20

40

under Sanitary

under the Panchayat Inspectors ~~Rules~~

~~Subordinate Officers~~

2. ~~Notice~~ definite proposals regarding the minimum staff required for the working of the new Rural Boards should be submitted to Govt very early

Dr Lt L-Sec

31/1

To.

The President, Rural Board of Bangalore

Chief Officer, Town Municipal Council, Bangalore City

" Comptroller

" Revenue Commissioner

AR

21/1/27

44357

MB 25-26-52

No. C.2.3 & (Encl one) M.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District,
Dated Bangalore, 4th February 1927.

From

S.Kiriannaiya, Esq., M.A., B.L.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To

B.Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-law.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Local and Legislative Depts.
Bangalore.

GEN. & REVT. SECTT. PR. 2 4 FEB. 1927 G. D. SECTION.

REVENUE 5 FEB 1927

Sir,

Adverting to your Memo No.L.4857 dated the 25th January 1927 re the postings of Sanitary Inspectors as Village Panchayat Inspectors, I have the honor to state that the President, Bangalore District Board in his letter No.525 dated the 8th January 1927 to Government (copy of which was sent to this office also) originally proposed to discharge the marginally noted Sanitary Inspectors without intimating the pay each of them was drawing. As I was given to understand that some of them were in receipt of a higher salary than Rs.60/-

1. Mr.RamalingaRaju,
2. ,,Hanumantharao,
3. ,,C.ChengalarayaNaidu,
4. ,,Varada Rao,
5. ,, S.Vairamudiappa

I requested Government to kindly issue definite instructions to the President to discharge only such of the Sanitary Inspectors as were drawing a salary of Rs.60/- or less. Accordingly Government were pleased to issue definite instructions on these lines to the President in their letter No.L.4751/L.B.25-26-40 dated 21st January 1927 and a copy of the letter was sent to this office also. The President was therefore requested to forward modified proposals in accordance with the instructions issued by Government.

2. The President forwarded modified proposals on 29th January 1927 to discharge B.Krishnaswami Mudaliar(Rs.53/-)in place of Chengalraya Naidu(Rs.57/-) and Mr.J.Tirumalachar(Rs.55/-)in place of Mr.V.Hanumantha Rao(Rs.67/6 his other proposals remaining unaltered. He has however condemned the work of both Varadarao and Ramalingaraju in no measured terms and stated that "their existence in the Taluks was quite useless".

3. In the face of these scathing remarks and as Varadarao was

(With his letter No.C.2.3 & to Govt. dated 28th January 1927.

42

drawing a salary of Rs.72/-(the last increment of Rs.5/- being sanctioned by the President himself so recently as the 20th January 1927)it was not possible to appoint Varada Rao as Village Panchayat Inspector. Though the case of Kamalinga Raju was not similar to that of Varada Rao in respect of pay(his pay is Rs.59/-) yet the President's condemnation of the official was equally strong and appointment as Village Panchayat Inspector became impossible. Accordingly a Memo copy of which is herein enclosed was issued appointing Chengalraya Naidu as Village Panchayat Inspector(the President had agreed to his transfer in his first communication) and reserving the question of the appointment of Kamalinga Raju as Vice-President Village Panchayat Inspector for separate consideration. The Amildar of the Hoskote Taluk under whom Kamalinga Raju is working had been asked to report about this official. In the meanwhile the President had addressed Government directly and without my knowledge insisting on the discharge of VaradaRao and KamalingaRaju without apprising me of what he had done, and Government have been pleased to sanction his recommendation in Government order No.5265-L.B.25-26-50 dated 31st January 1927).

4. In this connection I may be permitted to state that the -- Panchayat scheme now launched is in an experimental stage, and if the scheme is to have a chance of success it is very necessary to give the most competent, tactful and efficient men as Inspectors to help the Taluk Officers in the initial stages until the villagers come to understand and appreciate the institutions themselves. By this I do not intend that Sanitary Inspectors of long service who have earned their increments should be put to undue hardships and be discharged at an advanced stage in their service when it will be very hard for them to take to other avocations. But at the same time I do not think it would be fair for us to handicap Taluk officers by giving them the most useless and unwanted Sanitary

43

Inspectors and then blame such officers if there should be complaints from the public that the scheme has not been working satisfactorily.

5. In the circumstances I request that Government may be kindly pleased to reconsider their orders and direct the release of the marginally noted Sanitary Inspectors for being employed as Village Panchayat Inspectors. In anticipation of the kind approval of Government, Varadarao and Kamalingaraju have been directed to continue as Sanitary Inspectors.

X

S.Jhenreddiava Naidu 57/-
M.Ramachendriah 53/-

6. The Executive work of the District Board has been considerably minimised under the new dispensation and if there are inefficient Sanitary Inspectors it is better they continue under the District Board where the consequences of their inefficiency would be much less keenly felt than be transferred to the new line, as Village Panchayat Inspectors where a good deal of important original work has to be done. It is only this anxiety that has prompted me to suggest the above modification in the President's memo. after all it is a question of interchange of men and no official would -- suffer by the arrangement now made by me.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

K Srinivasan

Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District,
No.J-2-318/26-27 Dated Bangalore, 1st February 1927.

Memo.

The President of the District Board has in his final recommendation proposed to discharge the five Sanitary Inspectors noted on the margin. Of these, he considers that S.VaradaRao and KamalingaRaju are absolutely unfit for sanitary work and that their record in the Taluks where they served was very unsatisfactory and that he could not possibly retain them in the service of the District Board.

1. C.Tirumalachar,
2. B.Krishnaswami Mudaliar,
3. S.VaradaRao,
4. S.KamalingaRaju,
5. S.Vairamudiappa

2. As Varada Rao besides being reported on in these terms by the President is also getting a salary of Rs.72/-, it is not possible to entertain him as a Village Panchayat Inspector. His case will therefore be left for the consideration and disposal of the new District Board.

3. In place of Varada Rao who could not be appointed as Village Panchayat Inspector C.Chengalrava Naidu who is in receipt of a salary of Rs.57 and whom the President had agreed to transfer in his prior communication No.525/26-27 dated 8th January 1927 will be absorbed as a Village Panchayat Inspector.

2. As regards Kamalinga Raju, I find that the Amildar has recorded the opinion that he is fit to be appointed as Village Panchayat Inspector. This opinion is at variance with the considered view of the President of the District Board. Will the Amildar, therefore, please reply by return whether he is willing to have KamalingaRaju as Village Panchayat Inspector of Hoskote Taluk and whether he will undertake not to complain subsequently about the inefficiency of the official.

3. The following Sanitary Inspectors to whom the President of the District Board has given notices of discharge will be appointed to act as Village Panchayat Inspectors. -

1. Mr.C.Tirumalachar,
2. ,, B.Krishnaswami Mudaliar,
3. ,, S.Vairamudiappa,

Orders will separately issue regarding the appointment of other

46

G.R..S VI G 34]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 3670L

Section Lb

File No. 25-26

Serial No. 56

General and Revenue Secretariat

(L. & P)

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

, *the* 192

Date of issue 15-2-27

Signed by Hon'ble K. S.

1. Mr S. Veerannadiappa
2. " K. Ramalingaraju
3. Mr. Varadarao
4. " B. Krishnamurthi Mudaliar
5. " C. Jeevanalachar

May this be

i Printed ?

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette.

English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Read- G.O. No. £5265-7/Lb 25-26 dated 31st Jan. 1927 sanctioning appointment of the undermentioned Sanr. Inspectors as Village Panchayat Inspectors in the Bangalore District with the ~~[illegible]~~ designation ~~[illegible]~~ Mr. Varadarao as Panchayat Inspector will be paid Rs 60 plus Rs 15/- H.H. per mensem

~~Order Thereon No.~~

2. Letter No. C-2-318/26-27 dated 4th Feb 1927 from the Dy Comr Bangalore Dist, stating that, if the Panchayat Scheme for Lanchayat is to have a chance of success, it is

In his opinion Messrs. Varadarao & Ramalingaraja are unfit for Village Panchayat Inspectors and proposing that in modification of the order read above, two officials may continue as Inspectors and Messrs. Channabasavaiah & Ramachandraiah appointed as Vill. Panchayat Inspectors.

...pendent tactful and eff...
...ers + Inspectors to help the
...Officers in the initial stages
...stead of giving them the most use...
...ed unwanted Sanit Inspectors (viz
...rs Varada Rao and Ramalingaraju)
and requesting therefore that the G.O
of the 31st Jan: 1927 read above may be re-
considered, that the release of the
...rginally noted Sanit Inspectors
...ay be directed to be cancelled
Village Panchayat Inspectors in place
...rs Varada Rao and Ramaliga
...ju, who have been directed subject
...approval of Govt to continue as
...anit Insp...

1 Mr. Chengalraya Naidu
2. Mr. Ramachandriah

order No. 5704-11

The proceedings of the Dy
Com: Bangalore Dist: is sometime
tentatively pending the decision of
the new District Board in the
matter. This cancels the appointment
of Messrs Varada Rao and Ramaliga-
raju as Panchayat Inspectors as
granted in the G.O of the 31st Jan: 1927
read above.

1. The Dy Com: is hereby authorised

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 1888—GPB—1,000,000—21-12-21

G. R. S. G/33]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

~~circumstances~~, If the new Board decide to discharge these two men, the D.C. may ~~it will have to~~ pay them as Village Panchayat Inspectors and dispense with their services, if found unsatisfactory.

Secl Sy

Copy to the Secy Bangalore Dist
" Comptroller
" ~~Comptroller~~
Rev Comr

Copy to the President, Dist Board of Bangalore

9/5
17/9/37